



STATE OF WASHINGTON
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-34310 • (360) 753-7808 • TDD (360) 753-7809

DRAFT PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA
University of Washington, Walker Ames Room, Kane Hall
October 27, 1999

**Approximate
Times**

Tab

8:00 a.m.	Board Breakfast and Meeting Overview <i>(No official Board action will be taken at this time.)</i>	
9:00	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bob Craves, HECB Chair• President Richard McCormick, University of Washington	
	Adoption of September HECB Meeting Minutes	1
	WORK SESSION: Draft Final Master Plan Text <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholder Report• Final Report: Employer Survey• Recommendations: text and fiscal analysis	2
	Public Comment on 2000 Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• American Electronics Association	
	Adoption of Master Plan 2000 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>(Resolution 99-39)</i>	
	Legislative Grants Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HECB staff briefing	3

2000 Legislative Higher Education Issues**4**

- HECB staff briefing

11:45

L U N C H

(Executive Session)

1:15-2:30

UW Technology Presentation**CONSENT AGENDA**

BA in Human Services Cybersite Program, WWU

5

- (Resolution 99-38)

DIRECTOR'S REPORT**PUBLIC COMMENT****ADJOURNMENT**

3:00 p.m.

CAMPUS TOUR**Next HECB Meeting**

<i>DAY/DATE</i>	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>TENTATIVE LOCATION</i>
Dec. 3, 1999 (Fri.)	Regular meeting	Utilities & Transportation Commission, Olympia

If you are a person with disability and require an accommodation for attendance, or need this agenda in an alternative format, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7800 as soon as possible to allow sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.

The full board packet is available at www.hecb.wa.gov.

**HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 15, 1999**

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby
Mr. David Shaw
Mr. Jim Faulstich
Mr. Larry Hanson
Ms. Kristianne Blake
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins
Dr. Frank Brouillet
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn

HECB Staff

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director
Ms. Linda Schactler, Deputy Director
Mr. Bruce Botka, Dir. Gov't Relations
Ms. Becki Collins, Dir. Educational Services
Ms. Elaine Jones, Senior Program Associate
Mr. Dan Keller, Senior Associate Director
Dr. Kathe Taylor, Associate Director
Mr. Jim Reed, Associate Director
Mr. John Fricke, Associate Director
Dr. Tom Weko, Associate Director

Introductions

Mr. Bob Craves, HECB Chair, welcomed meeting participants and initiated Board introductions.

Minutes of July 15, 1999, Meeting

Mr. Larry Hanson moved for approval of the minutes as recorded. **Ms. Kristi Blake** seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

Work Session - 2000 Master Plan Draft

• **Employer Survey**

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director, provided a brief outline of the Master Plan work session. He introduced Dr. Tom Weko, HECB Associate Director who led the work on assessing Washington State employer education preferences and needs.

The HECB undertook the study to clarify information about the level of education employers will require of workers between now and 2010. The HECB contracted with Elway Research to conduct four focus groups with employers in the state, which institutional representatives were invited to observe. HECB staff analyzed data provided by Washington State Employment Security, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, and other sources.

Some of the preliminary findings of the draft study:

- Of the new jobs that will be created, 30.2 percent are expected to require a baccalaureate or advanced degree.
- Much of this growth will occur in the information technology sector.
- Washington employers say they need more workers with baccalaureate-level education or higher.

Dr. Weko suggested that the enrollment goals proposed in the 2000 Master Plan will help provide the increased number of workers with baccalaureate or advanced degrees that the economy needs.

Draft Master Plan 2000

Mr. Gaspard reminded that in the July meeting, the Board had approved a table of Master Plan recommendations and directed staff to turn the table into an actual draft text. Further, the subcommittee asked staff to produce a document that was clear, simple, and concise.

Ms. Linda Schactler, HECB Deputy Director, discussed the draft recommendations, strategies and goals. In subcommittee meetings, consensus was reached on the major message of the plan – that in the near future, there will be an increase in the number of people wanting to go to college. The Master Plan is therefore geared towards that. The budget for the plan is still under development and the final numbers will be presented for Board approval in the October meeting.

Mr. Craves discussed the need to explain the relationship between the Master Plan and the recommendations of the Governors 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Mr. Larry Hanson commented that marketing the plan would be the next critical piece. Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins wants to see a document that “...has the ability to update itself.” Ms. Ramsay-Jenkins noted that “The Board should be able to get back to the plan to see what’s working well, what needs to be changed or improved upon.”

Dr. Gay Selby stated that the interface with the K-12 system needs to be made clearer. “We don’t have strategies on the academic side. We would like to create a more seamless system.” Mr. Gaspard and Mr. Craves agreed on the need to expand upon the work we are doing with the K-12 education reform. Mr. David Shaw suggested more overt expressions showing broad scale adherence to K-12 education reform. Ms. Ramsay-Jenkins suggested that specific language to that effect be added to the preface.

Mr. Jim Reed and Mr. John Fricke, HECB Associate Directors, discussed expected capital costs and operating costs respectively.

Mr. Jim Faulstich requested clarification between anticipated student growth versus anticipated population growth. Mr. Fricke responded that enrollment will be at a faster growth because of the age of the population before 2010. It will be the other way around after 2010.

Dr. Selby sought confirmation that increased in-state funding for higher education is essentially support for increased FTEs. Mr. Fricke agreed that it is predominantly that, and financial aid.

Public comments on Draft Master Plan 2000

Institutional representatives included Dr. Fred Campbell, UW; Dr. Jane Sherman, WSU; Mr. Karl Jonietz, Olympic College; Dr. Sandy Wall, SBCTC; Dr. Dave Dauwalder, CWU; Dr. Joann Taricani, UW; Ms. Kim Merriman, TESC; Dr. Carl Simpson, WWU; and Mr. Tom Parker, WAICU. Discussion focused on the following points:

- The Master Plan should show the relationship among its recommendations and those of the 2020 commission;

- Need for stronger K-12 link;
- “Rule-free” zones strongly endorsed, particularly by the two-year colleges;
- Bulk of the plan is on access, with less than 1 percent provided for incentives.
- Would like to strengthen the discussion of the role of independent institutions in the plan.

ACTION: **Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-37. **Dr. Frank Brouillet** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-37 was **unanimously approved**, with the understanding that staff would continue to gather input and refine the recommendations and the language of the draft.

Higher Education Cost Study

Mr. Dan Keller, HECB Senior Associate Director, and Ms. Kathy Raudenbush, HECB Policy Associate, briefed the Board on the study which is conducted every four years. They reported no dramatic shifts from the last cost study.

Dr. Chang Mook Sohn inquired about the proportion of increased cost in the Master Plan that students will pay. Mr. Keller responded that it will go up slightly with the rise in per capita income.

Promise Scholarship

Ms. Becki Collins, HECB Director for Educational Services, provided an update on the program. She recognized the hard work of HECB program staff and information services staff in getting the program up and running in extremely short time frame. About 2300 to 2400 students will receive an award of \$1100 each.

The scholarship funds will be granted much as the State Need Grant: for students enrolled in public institutions, the funds will be funneled through the institutions; students enrolled in private institutions will receive the funds directly from the HECB.

ACTION: **Dr. Gay Selby** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-36. **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-36 was **unanimously approved**.

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Dr. Terry Bergeson praised the learner-centered focus of the Master Plan and expressed enthusiasm for closer linkages between K-12 and higher education. She proposed a meeting among OSPI, the HECB, the State Board of Education, the SBCTC, the Commission on Student Learning, and other concerned groups — including “the people in the system, those who do the work on the ground” — to talk about partnerships and initiatives that transition from one system to the next.

Dr. Bergeson said that the WA Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) should be a prerequisite for students going into the Running Start program. She envisions WASL as becoming the door to tech prep and Running Start: “Everyone have to partner on this – business, students, families, schools, etc.”

Dr. Brouillet: “Assuming the WASL is on line. What are your thoughts on the students who may not make it?” Dr. Bergeson: “The reason it is given in the 10th grade is that it gives students time to do it again. We have kids now that can’t meet the standards. That’s why we can’t do this too quickly. There are also physical and cognitive disabilities that would stop them from achieving it. There should be things in place to point kids in *a* direction.”

Mr. James Faulstich inquired about the repercussions of the accountability issues on the WASLs and asked, “What is in our current system?” Dr. Bergeson responded that intervention is carried out in the school, district, and state levels.

Accountability

Mr. Bruce Botka, HECB Director for Governmental Relations, reviewed recent legislative work on accountability issues. There were no significant changes introduced during the legislative session except that the accountability measures no longer have a financial penalty attached to them. However, the Legislature remains very committed to the idea of continued performance improvement.

Dr. Kathe Taylor, HECB Associate Director, provided an overview of the process used by the staff and the institutions to develop the 1999-2001 accountability plans, and described the recommendations from the institutions, including the alternative measures submitted by the University of Washington.

Representatives from the institutions then made brief presentations, addressing particular strengths in their accountability plans as well as areas that don’t appear to reflect “measurable and specific” improvements. Institutional representatives included Barbara Smith, TESC; Dave Dauwalder, CWU; Flash Gibson, EWU; Fred Campbell, UW; Jane Sherman, WSU; and Carl Simpson, WWU.

ACTION: **Dr. Frank Brouillet** moved for consideration of revised Resolution 99-30, which includes the alternative measures from the University of Washington. **Mr. Larry Hanson** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-30 was **unanimously approved**.

Comments from Rep. Don Carlson on accountability

Mr. Gaspard introduced Rep. Don Carlson, co-chair of the House Higher Education Committee, who provided comments on accountability initiatives. “There need to be **incentives**. If the institutions are doing what we ask, there should be a pool of money that we can reward them with. There should also be **consequences**. What do they want to be measured for? It’s important to ask – why didn’t they reach those goals?”

Accountability is an issue in the western states and also nationwide. Next year, two important items will be examined: accountability in higher education and the concept of branch campuses.

Legislative Assignments

Mr. Botka reviewed several of the HECB assignments from the 1999 legislative session and described the process that was used to evaluate the various proposals. He presented the review of the **Information Technology Grants**. Dr. Taylor reviewed the **Fund for Innovation** recommendations, and Ms. Elaine Jones, HECB Senior Program Associate, reviewed the **Teacher Training Pilot Project** recommendations.

ACTION: **Mr. James Faulstich** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-31, recommending approval of the Information Technology Instruction Grants. **Mr. David Shaw** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-31 was unanimously approved.

ACTION: **Dr. Gay Selby** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-32, recommending approval of the Fund for Innovation grants. **Mr. David Shaw** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-32 was unanimously approved.

ACTION: **Dr. Frank Brouillet** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-33, recommending approval of the Teacher Training Pilot Projects. **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-33 was unanimously approved.

Mr. Botka also gave a brief update on three other projects that are being developed:

- Child Care Grants
- High-demand Enrollments
- Master's in Teaching Reimbursement Program

Dr. Selby expressed concern “with the new and different roles the agency staff is having to take on that is requiring a lot of staff time and maintenance. Are we prepared for this?” Mr. Gaspard responded that staffing issues are being worked on.

WSU Spokane Management Plan and Mission Statement

Mr. Craves reminded that in the July Board meeting, WSU was asked to come back and address this issue. In the interim, EWU, Gonzaga University, Whitworth College, and the Community Colleges of Spokane collaborated in reviewing the Addendum prepared by WSU and subsequently expressed support for WSU's Spokane mission statement and operating plan.

Dr. Brouillet reiterated his concern expressed at the last meeting that with approval of WSU's program plan, the HECB will be opening the door for doctoral programs on the branch campuses. If we approve this, will the other branches have to change their mission statements if they want to add a doctoral program, he asked. Mr. Gaspard replied that program plans will be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Brouillet said he would not support approval of the resolution. Dr. Selby said she would vote to approve although she didn't think the language about doctoral programs belonged in a mission statement.

ACTION: **Mr. David Shaw** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-34. **Ms. Kristi Blake** seconded the motion. Resolution 99-34 was approved with Dr. Frank Brouillet dissenting.

New Programs Approved

ACTION: **Ms. Kristi Blake** moved for consideration of all the consent agenda items for approval. **Mr. David Shaw** seconded the motion. The following resolutions were unanimously approved:

- Resolution 99-35, Running Start Program Rule Amendment
- Resolution 99-27, BA in Elementary Education/TESL, CWU Wenatchee Center
- Resolution 99-28, MS in Physical Education, Health Education and Leisure Services/Addictionology, CWU Steilacoom
- Resolution 99-29, BS in Community Health Education/Chemical Dependency, CWU Centers in Yakima, SeaTac, Steilacoom and Wenatchee

Meeting Adjourned 4: 30 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-28

WHEREAS, Central Washington University is proposing to establish a Master of Science in Physical Education, Health Education, and Leisure Services/Addictionology at the CWU Steilacoom Center; and

WHEREAS, the program will provide greater graduate-level educational opportunities for place-bound populations in the Puget Sound region; and

WHEREAS, the program addresses the growing need for qualified addiction management personnel in the public and private sectors; and

WHEREAS, the costs are reasonable for delivering a program of this nature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University request to establish a Master of Science in Physical Education, Health Education, and Leisure Services/Addictionology at the CWU Steilacoom Center.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-27

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education/Teaching English as a Second Language at the CWU Wenatchee Center; and

WHEREAS, The program will enhance upper-division educational opportunities for under-served populations in the Wenatchee area; and

WHEREAS, The program will bring more qualified people into the teaching profession with special training in teaching English as a second language; and

WHEREAS, The program will be supported through existing resources and the costs are reasonable; and

WHEREAS, The diversity and assessment plans are thorough;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University request to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education/Teaching English as a Second Language at the CWU Wenatchee Center, effective fall 1999.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-29

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested to establish a Bachelor of Science in Community Health Education/Chemical Dependency at CWU Centers in Yakima, SeaTac, Steilacoom, and Wenatchee; and

WHEREAS, The program will address the growing demand for better prepared professionals in chemical dependency services; and

WHEREAS, The program will enhance upper-division educational opportunities for place-bound populations in several regions of the state; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable; and

WHEREAS, The program will make effective use of existing faculty and resources;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University request to establish a Bachelor of Science in Community Health Education/Chemical Dependency at CWU Centers in Yakima, SeaTac, Steilacoom, and Wenatchee, effective fall 1999.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-30

WHEREAS, In its 1999-2001 biennial budget the Legislature directed the public baccalaureate institutions to prepare accountability plans for the 1999-2001 biennium that would lead to "measurable and specific" improvements toward the performance goals; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board developed and approved Accountability Guidelines in July 1999 for the institutions' 1999-2001 Accountability Plans; and

WHEREAS, In the guidelines, the Higher Education Coordinating Board gave responsibility for setting meaningful targets to the institutions; and

WHEREAS, The institutions have presented their accountability plans to the Board

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approve the 1999-2001 Accountability Plans presented by Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, The Evergreen State College, Washington State University, and Western Washington University;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board postpone approval of the 1999-2001 Accountability Plan presented by the University of Washington pending further justification of the performance goals that are lower than actual performance in 1997-98.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-31

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has been directed by the Legislature and Governor, under the terms of Senate Bill 5180 as enacted on May 14, 1999, to administer an information technology instruction grant program during the 1999-2001 biennium; and

WHEREAS, The Board, via *Resolution 99-27*, adopted a process for review and approval of the 1999-2001 information technology instruction grant proposals; and

WHEREAS, The HECB staff and external experts in the field have evaluated the grant proposals in accordance with the adopted process and recommend funding the following information technology instruction projects:

1. University of Washington, A Proposal to Double the Size of the Computer Engineering Undergraduate Major Program, in the amount of \$1 million for the 1999-2001 biennium, with half of the total to be provided each year;
2. Washington State University, Increasing the Capacity of the Computer Science Program, in the amount of \$280,000 for the 1999-2001 biennium, with half of the total to be provided each year;
3. Washington State University, Embedded Computer Systems Laboratory, in the amount of \$220,000 for the 1999-2001 biennium, with half of the total to be provided each year; and
4. Western Washington University, Proposal for the Center for Internet Studies, in the amount of \$274,518 for the 1999-2001 biennium, with \$122,075 to be provided during FY 2000 and \$152,443 to be provided during FY 2001; and

WHEREAS, The University of Washington and Washington State University have secured the required matching contributions of non-state cash or donations equivalent to the grant amount; and

WHEREAS, Western Washington University has secured informal agreements for matching donations but has not received either the donations or written pledges that the donations will be received upon the approval of the State grant proposal; and

WHEREAS, the four grants described above account for \$1,774,518 of the \$2 million total funds available, leaving \$225,482 available for additional grants;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the grants to the University of Washington and Washington State University as outlined in Nos. 1, 2, and 3 above, effective September 15, 1999;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the grant to Western Washington University as outlined in No. 4 above, on the condition that the state funds be released only upon a demonstration by Western Washington University that it has received the required contributions of non-state cash or donations equivalent to the grant amount. The staff may release these funds in increments as the donations are received by the university. Any of these funds that are not released to WWU by November 15 will revert to a common pool for which the other public baccalaureate institutions may compete in a second-round grant process as outlined in the following paragraph; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the staff of the Higher Education Coordinating Board be directed to conduct a second competitive grant process during which all of the baccalaureate institutions except for the University of Washington may submit competitive proposals for any information technology instruction grant funding which remains uncommitted as of November 15, 1999; and

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED, that as a result of a second competitive grant process for the residual Information Technology Grant funds, the staff of the HECB shall recommend to the Board the disposition of the remaining funds by December 3, 1999.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-32

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has been directed by the Legislature to administer The Fund for Innovation and Quality in Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, The Board, in compliance with Section Three of SHB 1013 and in accordance with HECB Resolution 99-27, did establish a process for review and approval of the 1999-2000 Fund for Innovation grant proposals; and

WHEREAS, The HECB staff and external experts have evaluated the grant proposals in accordance with the adopted process and recommend funding the following Fund for Innovation proposals:

1. "Asynchronous, Community-Based Education for Registered Nurse Students in Washington State," Washington State University College of Nursing, Intercollegiate Center for Nursing Education, \$109,499.
2. "Co-located and Co-designed Academic and Student Services for the Transferring Student," Eastern Washington University, \$88,121.
3. "Implementing A Critical Thinking Rubric For Assessment of Student Progress, For Diagnostic Use, and as a Teaching Tool," Washington State University, \$59,350.
4. "Improving American Indian Student Reading Through Culturally Appropriate, Contextual Curriculum Units," The Evergreen State College, \$87,366.
5. "Multimedia Arts Program," Washington State University, Vancouver, \$91,600.
6. "Mutual Transcript Research Enterprise," University of Washington, \$57,166.
7. "Program of Collaborative Science Resources for High School and College Students in Washington State," Central Washington University, \$99,897.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves these grants to these recipients in the amounts specified above, and directs HECB staff to release the funding upon the execution of interagency agreements spelling out the terms of the grant process.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-33

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has been directed by the Legislature and Governor to administer a teacher training pilot grant program during the 1999-2001 biennium; and

WHEREAS, The Board, via *Resolution 99-27*, adopted a process for review and approval of the 1999-2001 teacher training pilot program grant proposals; and

WHEREAS, The HECB staff and external experts in the field have evaluated the grant proposals in accordance with the adopted process, and recommend funding the following teacher training pilot programs:

1. Western Washington University, Everett Community College, Skagit Valley Community College, Whatcom Community College Teacher Training Pilot Program in Collaboration with Bellingham, Blaine, Everett, and Sedro Woolley School Districts in the amount of \$149,966 for the 1999-2001 biennium.
2. University of Washington, Bothell Teacher Training Pilot Program in Collaboration with Cascadia Community College District and North Shore and Lake Washington School Districts in the amount of \$144,698 for the 1999-2001 biennium.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the release of grant funding to the Western Washington University Teacher Training Pilot Program in the amount of \$149,966 for the 1999-2001 biennium, and to the University of Washington, Bothell Teacher Training Pilot Program in the amount of \$144,698 for the 1999-2001 biennium, effective September 15, 1999. Half of the total funding shall be made available each year of the biennium.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-34

WHEREAS, In 1998, the Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area, and continue to provide the highest quality education for students; and

WHEREAS, In December 1998, the HECB granted conditional approval for *WSU's Planning for Higher Education in Spokane*, pending the July 1, 1999, completion of:

1. A Riverpoint-specific mission statement that emphasizes the provision of graduate and research program delivery plans that include predominately on-site instruction;
2. Re-evaluation of the proposed Executive Development Center;
3. Continued development of the Health Sciences Consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study;
4. A market analysis/education needs assessment to determine how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide, as well as in the immediate Spokane area; and
5. A final facilities management plan for the Riverpoint campus that incorporates findings from the additional assessment (described above) and final information about EWU Spokane programs; and

WHEREAS, There has been collaboration among WSU, EWU, Gonzaga University, Whitworth College, and the Community Colleges of Spokane in reviewing the *WSU Planning for Higher Education in Spokane Addendum* dated July 31, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has found that WSU has satisfactorily completed the tasks cited above;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby approves Washington State University's final *Planning for Higher Education in Spokane and Addendum*, submitted October 15, 1998 and July 31, 1999, and final *Facilities Management Plan*, submitted July 1, 1999; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to the WSU higher education community. Developing a mission statement and program and facilities planning are critical and challenging assignments. WSU has taken positive steps to refocus higher education services in the Spokane area.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-35

WHEREAS, Section 600.390 of Title 28 A of the Revised Code of Washington authorizes the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to adopt rules governing the Running Start program jointly with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI); and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges have filed with the Code Reviser's office proposed amendments to the rules by referencing amended sections filed by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments to the Running Start program make the following clarifications:

- Running Start students may not be charged tuition until a student's enrollment exceeds 18 credit hours for a quarter or semester, and
- The 15-hour definition of "full-time equivalent enrollment" only applies to the allocation of state funding, as distinguished from the definition of a student's 18 credit-hour tuition free entitlement; and

WHEREAS, These proposed amendments to the rules do not change the nature or intent of the Running Start program, but are simply administrative in nature and permit students to participate fully at the same rate as all college and university students; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendments on August 27, 1999, at which no written or verbal testimony were received; and

WHEREAS, Copies of chapter 392-169 WAC which sets forth policies and procedures governing the Running Start program are available in the offices of the HECB, the SBCTC, and the OSPI located in Olympia, Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board supports the continued implementation of the Running Start program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the permanent rule revisions to the Running Start program identified below.

NEW SECTION

WAC 250-79-030 Adoption by reference. Adopting Running Start rule revisions by reference to amended sections WAC 392-169-025; 392-169-030; 392-169-055; 392-169-057; and 392-169-060, filed by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction by WSR 99-13-124, filed 6/16/99.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-36

WHEREAS, The 1999 Washington Legislature authorized the Washington Promise Scholarship Program; and

WHEREAS, The program offers scholarships to the top ten percent of the 1999 graduating high school class, and the top fifteen percent of the 2000 graduating high school class who meet certain income and enrollment criteria; and

WHEREAS, The Board is responsible for the administration of the program including all student eligibility decisions and the disbursement of awards; and

WHEREAS, The first class of eligible scholarship recipients are enrolling for the fall 1999 term and the first disbursements will be made in October 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature authorized the Board to adopt rules for the program;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt as emergency rules Washington Administrative Code 250-80-010 through 250-80-100 as attached hereto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That staff begin the permanent rules making process with opportunity for public comment and an anticipated adoption date no later than January 31, 2000.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-37

WHEREAS, State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to prepare *a comprehensive master plan that includes but is not limited to: Assessments of the state's higher education needs; recommendations on enrollment and other policies and actions to meet those needs; and guidelines for continuing education, adult education, public service, and other higher education programs; and*

WHEREAS, The Board has insisted on an open and inclusive process, sensitive to its statutory role to represent the "broad public interest in higher education, above the interests of individual institutions; and

WHEREAS, The Board has considered a number of in-depth policy papers designed to discuss and analyze the issues central to the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, In July, 1999, the Board approved an outline for the 2000 Master Plan, including three primary policy goals that summarize the vision for higher education presented by this Master Plan, strategies that characterize each policy goal, and specific initiatives that described specific steps that should be taken in order to effect the strategy and policy goal to which each is linked; and

WHEREAS, The Board has considered draft text and revised recommendations, which are based on the July table of recommendations; and

WHEREAS, The Board has directed staff to include their comments and discussion in the next draft of the Master Plan, which the Board will consider in October;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the draft Master Plan presented on September 15, 1999, and directs staff to further refine the recommendations and draft a final Master Plan for consideration at the Board's October meeting.

Adopted:

September 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Draft Master Plan Recommendations

October 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to prepare a comprehensive master plan that, among other things, assesses higher education needs and makes recommendations on actions to meet those needs. The statute identifies the primary audience for this plan as the Legislature and Governor, to whom the HECB is directed to submit the plan by January 1, 2000.

In September 1998, HECB Chair Bob Craves appointed a Master Plan subcommittee: Bob Craves, Gay Selby, Anne Ramsay-Jenkins, and Jim Faulstich. The Board approved a process for developing the Master Plan in December 1998; in January the Board held a planning session to discuss members' visions and goals for the plan.

In the winter and spring of 1999, the subcommittee met in communities across the state with a wide variety of higher education "stakeholders." And the subcommittee itself met regularly with staff to assess and direct the development of the plan, including the development of policy papers designed to discuss and analyze in-depth, the issues central to the Master Plan. The Board meetings also have given the public at large and institutions the opportunity to comment on the papers. In May, the Board began a series of meetings of a diverse advisory committee, which meets on-line one week per month to discuss topics central to the Master Plan.

In September the Board approved draft Master Plan text, and directed staff to refine the draft for consideration at the Board's regular meeting in October.

BOARD ACTION

Presented for Board consideration and consideration of approval is (final) draft Master Plan language to create a published document, printed and available for distribution by December 1999.

Draft Master Plan Recommendations

October 1999

THE PROBLEM *[insert enrollment graph]*

Washington State must find a way to make college education available to at least 70,900¹ additional students between 2001 and 2010. That's enough students to fill two more campuses the size of the University of Washington. About 52,500² of those students are likely to show up at public colleges and universities. This challenge occurs in an era of restricted state budgeting³. How do we know this human wave of students is approaching? Demographics tell us so. If Washington State maintains its level of college enrollment, just the growth in traditional college-age children of the Baby Boom generation, will account for about 36,300 of those new college students⁴.

Employers and employees, however, say that just maintaining the status quo is not enough. In a world where information changes every time a computer mouse clicks, a high school education is increasingly unlikely to keep up with the complexity of life in modern communities. And many employers say a high school education is not enough to get and keep a good job.⁵ In fact, our citizens miss out on some of the best jobs in the state because they do not possess the education required for the jobs. Instead, employers bring well-educated, highly skilled people into Washington State from other states and other countries where they had the opportunity to get a college education.⁶

Clearly that's a loss for the Washington citizens who may have to settle for other, less well paying jobs. It's a loss for businesses that have to spend money to recruit employees from out-of-state. And it's a loss for the state, not just because of the missed opportunity for citizens, but because of the increased pressure in-migration places on the environment, schools, roads, and other public resources.

Master Plan Continuing Commitments: Reaffirm the State's Commitment to Opportunity in Higher Education

The fundamental message of the 1996 Master Plan, which the Legislature adopted, was that the state would experience a significant increase in the demand for higher education through 2010, and that the state should meet that demand. The 2000 Master Plan carries forward that message, which is the underlying premise for all of the recommendations included in the 2000 Master Plan.

¹ HECB enrollment analysis in Master Plan Policy Papers 1 and 3 identifies about 80,000 students, however, about 10,000 of those FTE were funded for 1999 – 01, or served by independent institutions.

² Ibid.

³ Initiative 601 limits the growth in the state operating budget to the combined three-year average of inflation and population growth.

⁴ OFM demographic forecasts.

⁵ HECB employer focus groups

⁶ Washington Software Alliance, 1998 survey.

Higher education expands and enriches the lives of our citizens. It permits them to take advantage of career opportunities in this state; to thrive in an increasingly technological, knowledge-based world; and to enjoy an improved quality of life in their communities. In short, higher education is the door to full participation in American life.

Meeting the growing demand for higher education will require continued public investment to expand enrollments in public institutions and to keep college affordable. Cooperative planning among colleges and universities will be necessary to expand enrollments in the high-demand programs that students and employers will need. Therefore, the 2000 Master Plan reiterates the full commitment of the Higher Education Coordinating Board to the fundamental goal of sustaining and enhancing Washington State's commitment to higher education opportunity through the following strategies:

- **Reaffirm the policy goal of providing to state residents the opportunity for college education, approximately 52,500 at public colleges and universities through 2010.**⁷
- **Keep public higher education affordable for Washington citizens,** by linking future changes in tuition at public colleges and universities to the rate of change in state per capita personal income (PCPI), which is one gauge of the ability of state residents to meet higher tuition costs.
- **Provide education opportunity to those who cannot afford to attend without assistance through an array of financial aid programs. The state should place priority on assistance to the lowest-income students through the State Need Grant program with grant award amounts equivalent to resident tuition rates at Washington's public colleges and universities. The HECB supports increased funding for the State Work Study program so that more needy students can earn a part of their educational expenses. And the Board will adapt financial aid programs as necessary to respond to emerging needs and to fit new learning patterns and education modes.**

THE SOLUTION: SHARED RESPONSIBILITY, SHARED BENEFIT

Washington must explore and support every viable alternative to meet the demand for college education, and to enable every Washington citizen to meet his or her education goals. But no one person or institution can meet this challenge alone. All have a role to play, and all will benefit.

First, the state must renew its commitment to its citizens by reaffirming a century-old record of support for broad access to public higher education. Broad public access to college depends upon continued support for enrollment, for affordable tuition, and for financial assistance for those who need it most. And, because our primary challenge is to create higher education opportunity for all kinds of Washington citizens in all phases of their lives, ***we must make student learning the top priority in higher education.***

⁷ HECB enrollment demand analysis includes employer demand, demographic changes, and other factors. For more detail, please see attachment #.

Our public colleges and universities must seek every opportunity to use public resources to the fullest, to be as effective as possible within the precious resources available to them. When student learning needs conflict with campus tradition, the education needs of learners must come first. Electronic learning (e-learning) technologies hold great promise in making learning more accessible, more interesting, and more convenient. Although it challenges many university traditions, e-learning clearly offers rich possibilities that must not go unexplored. Campus traditions and state “red tape” shouldn’t be allowed to entangle learners. If student learning is our top priority, then we must place the interests of learners at the center of higher education decision making.

Institutions also must embrace new learning technologies and operate smarter and better through new partnerships: with public and independent schools; with business and state agencies; with K-12 and postsecondary schools. Our colleges and universities must continue to seek opportunities to reach out to people who traditionally have not been able to go to college: the low-income, people of color, and those whose jobs or geographic locations make going to school virtually impossible.

New higher education providers are moving rapidly to reach out to those traditional education has left behind. Many adult learners need to pick up additional education or new skills while they are going to work and rearing a family. That is not always possible in a traditional campus environment and established university schedule. Many students will seek their education within the rich learning environment offered by traditional schools and schedules. But for others, the new flexibility offered by many independent colleges and universities — for-profit or non-profit — will be a good option. The state should continue to make student aid available to those with financial need and who choose a non-public college or university.

Students share a responsibility, too, in making college more accessible. Many students will come to college already having earned college credits while still in high school, but all must come prepared to do college-level work. All students must pay their fair share of the cost of education. And learners must strive to make effective use of the money the state invests in them by choosing their education paths thoughtfully. We can help students and families make good decisions about their higher education goals, if we provide better information to them about what is available and what is at stake. That means communicating through media and language that is appropriate to the audiences we address. And we must find ways to bring higher education to those who do not live near traditional campuses.

In short, we must support and explore all viable means of providing education opportunity to the people of Washington State. What is at risk is nothing less than our social and economic prosperity. The HECB, therefore, presents the following goals to help Washington citizens attain their education goals.

2000 MASTER PLAN GOALS AND STRATEGIES

GOAL 1. Make Student Learning the Yardstick by Which We Measure Accountability, Efficiency, and Effectiveness.

Higher education must place learners at the center of decision making. In such an environment student learning is the ultimate “accountability” measure, and the prime responsibility of colleges and universities shifts from delivering teaching to producing learning. What we measure often sends a clear signal about what we value. We cannot measure every aspect of learning or higher education’s contribution to society that is important. But we can convey the value of student learning by seeking to clarify and understand some of the expectations we have for students. Washington State has made student learning the highest priority in K-12 education; we must as well in postsecondary education. Students, families, faculty, policymakers, and employers will benefit by knowing that a degree represents proficiency in identified knowledge and skill areas. These areas should enhance students’ abilities to live and work in a democratic society.

STRATEGIES:

a.) Identify the skills and knowledge associated with statewide associate transfer degrees and with baccalaureate degrees.

The HECB will collaborate with education institutions, students, and employers to identify what students who have earned a baccalaureate degree or an associate’s degree should know and be able to do. The HECB will work to expand the assessment of senior writing already underway. We will pilot institution-appropriate assessment measures for one or more fundamental elements of student learning in addition to writing. And we will support the appropriation of innovation funds to strategies that enhance student learning.

GOAL 2. Link K-12 Achievement to Higher Education Opportunity.

Planning for college — academically and financially — cannot begin too early in life. We should seek incentives to encourage students to pursue academic excellence in elementary and secondary school, and to encourage families to save for their children’s college costs.

Washington state soon will require students to pass the Washington Assessment of Student Learning in 10th grade to earn a Certificate of Mastery and graduate from high school. But it is important to identify what students will need beyond the Certificate to prepare for college-level work. Public policy-makers and education institutions are poised at a unique moment: K-12 reform is creating a unique opportunity to redefine the junior and senior years of high school, and the interface with college. If we seize this opportunity, we can redefine the transitional years between high school and college, creating a rich new intersection of creativity and exploration.

Building this new bridge between college and high school will require of us all cooperation, inspiration, and courage.

STRATEGY:

a.) In collaboration with K-12 education, the HECB and postsecondary education institutions will work to build strong, new connections between postsecondary and secondary education. Those connections have begun to grow with such creative efforts as the Competency-based Admissions project, which brings together high school and college faculty to discuss what students should know and be able to do to be admitted to college.

The HECB historically has supported incentive funding to encourage new ideas and creativity in postsecondary education. The HECB can prompt similar creative initiatives and collaboration in grades 11 and 12, and the first year of college by making incentive funds available to schools and institutions that partner to effect innovative change.

b.) The HECB will propose new connections between the Guaranteed Education Tuition (GET) Program and the Washington Promise Scholarship, in order to encourage families to save for their children's college education, to encourage children to do well in school, and to encourage employer investment in families' college savings.

The purpose of this initiative is to:

- Encourage people to plan for and save for their child's college education;
- Communicate to all children and their families the possibility and value of going to college;
- Create a venue for employers to contribute to the college savings of employees; and
- Create an incentive for children to study hard and do well in school.

The HECB will, with appropriate approval, set up GET accounts with tuition units for all kindergarten students at public schools, and communicate to families that those who save their money and study hard *can* go to college. And for those who do both, but still cannot afford all of the costs of college, a Washington Promise Scholarship may be available. This message would be repeated to families when students are in fourth, seventh, and tenth grades. Additional tuition units would be deposited in accounts of students who pass the fourth- and seventh-grade WASLs (Washington Assessment of Student Learning).

A Washington Promise scholarship equal to about two years of community college tuition would be available to the following students:

- Those whose family income is at or below 135 percent of the state's median family income,
- Who pass the WASL and earn a Certificate of Mastery,
- Who graduate from a Washington high school, and
- Who enroll in an accredited Washington college or university.

The scholarship would complement other state efforts to make college affordable for all academically qualified Washington residents.

GOAL 3. Empower citizens to make the best use of the available range of learning pathways.

College information is available on thousands of web sites and brochures for those who have the experiences and skills to explore and interpret our complicated system of higher education. For those who are first in their family to go to college, struggling to make ends meet, or who live in rural areas of our state, navigating and accessing the higher education system is daunting, if not impossible.

STRATEGY:

Create the Higher Education Lifelong Opportunity (HELLO) Network.

The HELLO network will provide the following consumer education and service functions:

- **provide college-bound audiences with information** about financial aid, admissions, transfers, and education services and requirements;
- **reach out to people historically under-represented in higher education** to inform them of the benefits of higher education, the academic requirements needed to get into college, and financial assistance available to those who qualify;
- **marshal education services in rural communities**, bringing together all available higher education and community resources to meet citizens' education needs; and,
- **guide citizens** through the on-line courses and programs available through a web-based, inter-institutional database of on-line courses, programs, and student services.

GOAL 4. Enhance Higher Education Opportunity Through Greater Use of E-learning Technologies.

E-learning technologies can provide new ways for faculty to teach and students to learn — both in and outside of traditional classroom space. E-learning can bring to the classroom new opportunities for innovation and quality, while conserving space that will be sorely needed as thousands of new learners seek a college education. However, the adoption of these technologies is not automatic. Faculty and staff need to be trained in the use of these new technologies, and encouraged to incorporate them into their teaching practices.

STRATEGIES:

a.) Promote the expanded adoption of e-learning technologies.

The HECB will establish an e-learning advisory team to inventory existing training efforts and establish e-learning training targets. The team will develop an inter-institutional, cross-sector strategy to assist instructional staff in using e-learning techniques and best practice. HECB will propose that the K-20 Educational Network Board establish a K-20 education program

subcommittee and devise an incentive program that recognizes and rewards innovation and excellence in e-teaching.

b.) Use public buildings to the fullest extent possible.

The state can save nearly \$90 million in capital expenditures (in 1999 dollars) and accommodate as many as 42,000 additional classroom FTE, if colleges and universities can achieve modest changes in the use of space. The Board has adopted the goal of serving an additional 52,500 students at the public colleges and universities by 2010. To accommodate this growth, the Board collaborated with the public institutions to evaluate how facilities are used, and to determine how e-learning might change the amount of student "seat-time" in classrooms and class labs.

This examination revealed that modest increases in the amount of time that classrooms and class labs are scheduled for use each week would produce a significant increase in institutional enrollment capacity. It also revealed that modest assumptions about instruction through e-learning also could increase the amount of classroom space available at public institutions.

The HECB recommends that classroom stations be used two additional hours per week and the average full-time equivalent student receives one and one-half lecture contact hours per week through e-learning. These modest changes could increase the classroom enrollment capacity of existing and planned space by as much as 42,000 full-time equivalent students at the public colleges and universities.

<p>GOAL 5. Enhance the ability of institutions to meet student needs and compete in an increasingly complex marketplace.</p>
--

Many rules are beneficial: they protect the welfare of students and the integrity of academic programs. When they do neither, we must revise and remove them — and we have. Although Washington has improved the ability of students to move among colleges and universities, students still say that they still experience barriers. Institutions say that rules — both their own and those of the state — hamper their ability to respond to the needs of students, particularly in creating or expanding high-enrollment programs.

STRATEGY:

a.) Identify and remove unwarranted obstacles to articulation and meeting student program demand.

Colleges and universities, in collaboration with their students, will identify to the HECB obstacles to meeting students' program demand, including but not limited to barriers to the transfer of credits. The HECB will analyze these studies and recommend, if warranted, changes in policies, practices, and structures.

The Board will propose the creation of "opportunity zones" that would allow institutions to start high-demand programs free of unnecessary institutional and state "red tape." And the Board will

work with employers, learners, and policy-makers to identify, in the Board's overall budget priorities, high-demand programs to which the state should target FTE enrollment.⁸

b.) Reward increased institutional productivity with greater budget flexibility.

All institutions should make gradual and sustained improvement in the quality of instruction and greater efficiencies in the use of faculty and other resources. Institutions should regularly re-evaluate highest priority functions, and direct internal resources to those priorities. Institutions should make measurable and significant progress toward cost-savings through steps unique to each college or university. Resources generated through cost-savings then could be directed to high-priority activities and initiatives, including faculty salary increases, investment in e-learning technology, staff and faculty training, recruitment and retention of high-demand faculty, and creating greater capacity in high-demand programs.

c.) Encourage education partnerships to enhance the quality and availability of higher education.

The partnerships should include public- and private-sector organizations, and education providers at every level: kindergarten through graduate school. Partnerships should identify the education and training needs for the state or a specific region; identify who can provide this training and education; and identify training / education strategies, including the specific contributions that each collaborator might provide. Partnerships with industry currently generate a great deal of direct and indirect financial support. By properly focusing and marshaling this support, and by using its organizational and managerial expertise, industry can be more effective in achieving its workforce development goals.

d.) Recognize and support "centers of excellence" at public colleges and universities.

Throughout our public institutions there are academic programs that are especially distinguished for their achievements in teaching, their research endeavors, and their public service. Washington State should formally recognize and support the outstanding achievements of these programs in order to help colleges and universities attract the best faculty, the brightest students, and private-sector support.

⁸ In the 1999 legislative session, the Legislature ear-marked 500 FTE for "high-demand" programs, to be allocated on an RFP basis by the HECB.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: MASTER PLAN CONTINUING COMMITMENT

The fundamental message of the 1996 Master Plan was that the state would experience significant increase in the demand for higher education between through 2010. The 2000 Master Plan carries forward that message, which is the underlying premise for *all of the recommendations included in the 2000 Master Plan*. This Master Plan also carries forward the following strategies for renewing Washington State's commitment to higher education opportunity:

CONTINUING COMMITMENT	STRATEGIES	RECOMMENDED ACTIONS
Renew Washington State's commitment to higher education opportunity.	<p>a.) Reaffirm the policy goal of providing to state residents the opportunity for college education.</p> <p>b.) Establish tuition policy that keeps public higher education student costs affordable and predictable.</p> <p>c.) Provide financial aid — both grants and work study — that meets the needs of students.</p>	<p>a.-1) In January 2000, the Legislature should adopt the policy goal of providing an additional 52,500 higher education FTE by 2010.</p> <p>a.-2) By September 2000, the HECB in coordination with public and independent two- and four-year colleges and universities, will prepare an enrollment accommodation plan for the years 2002 through 2010. This long-range plan will detail how enrollment growth will be accommodated; identify which institutions can add what number of enrollments; what investments (operating, capital, cultural or management change, etc) must occur to be successful; and identify the programs that will be expanded by different institutions to make sure high-demand fields are being adequately addressed.</p> <p>b.) In January 2001 the Legislature should limit future increases in tuition at public colleges and universities to changes in the per capita personal income (PCPI).</p> <p>c.) By 2003 the Legislature should fund state need grants at levels that equal the resident tuition rates at Washington's public colleges and universities, and that enable the state to serve applicants whose income is 65 percent of median family income.</p>

2000 MASTER PLAN GOALS

The following goals are presented as part of a strategic plan designed to enhance higher education opportunity by placing the interests of learners at the center of higher education decision making and investing and exploring the rich possibilities of electronic learning technologies.

GOAL 1	STRATEGIES	RECOMMENDED ACTION
Make Student Learning the Yardstick by Which We Measure Accountability, Efficiency, and Effectiveness.	a.) Identify the fundamental skills and knowledge associated with statewide associate transfer degrees and with baccalaureate degrees.	<p>a.-1) By June 2001, the HECB, in consultation with the public four-year institutions, should identify the fundamental student-learning performance measures associated with baccalaureate degrees.</p> <p>a.-2) By June 2001, the public four-year institutions should pilot one or more institution-appropriate assessment measures for student-learning, in addition to writing.</p> <p>a.-3) By December 2001, the HECB, in consultation with the public baccalaureate institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, should identify the fundamental learning performance measures associated with the statewide transfer associate degrees.</p> <p>a.-4) For the 2001-2003 biennium, the HECB will support linking appropriation of innovation funds to strategies that enhance the achievement of student learning.</p>
GOAL 2	STRATEGY	RECOMMENDED ACTION
Link K-12 achievement to higher education	<p>a.) The HECB, and postsecondary institutions will work to build strong, new connections between postsecondary and secondary education.</p> <p>b.) Link the GET program with the Washington Promise Scholarship.</p>	<p>a.-1) For the 2001-03 biennium the HECB will seek \$4 million to administer, in collaboration with OSPI, a K-16 partnership innovation initiative. This initiative would fund innovative strategies to enrich curriculum and create seamless transitions among grades 11 and 12, and the first year of college. <u>Grants would be available to school districts and postsecondary institutions that submit proposals jointly..</u></p> <p>a.-2) In coordination with faculty of public schools and baccalaureate institutions, by 2003 the HECB, will expand from four to 12 the number of school districts involved in curriculum and performance discussions associated with the Competency-based Admissions Standards project.</p> <p>b.) By Sept. 2000, the HECB will develop a program that opens for every kindergarten student at Washington public schools a GET account, and deposit tuition units at kindergarten, fourth and seventh grades. <u>The program would communicate early to students and families the possibility and value of going to college; create a venue for employers to contribute to employees' college savings; and encouraging children to study hard in school.</u></p>

GOAL 3	STRATEGY	RECOMMENDED ACTION
Empower citizens to make the best use of the range of learning pathways available.	a.) Create the Higher Education Lifelong Opportunity (HELLO) Network.	<p>a.-1) By June 2000 the HECB will conduct studies, surveys, and focus groups to identify and articulate specific needs of target audiences, and will establish the HELLO citizen advisory board.</p> <p>a.-2) By October 2000 the HECB will develop a strategic plan for citizen information and outreach.</p> <p>a.-3) By January 2001 the HECB will implement initial website and links (to be constantly revised and revisited thereafter).</p> <p>a.-4) By April 2001 the HECB will develop, prepare and disseminate marketing materials and conduct a public information outreach effort.</p>

GOAL 4	STRATEGIES	RECOMMENDED ACTION
Employ e-learning technology to enhance higher education capacity and quality.	<p>a.) Promote the expanded adoption of e-learning technologies.</p> <p>b.) Employ e-learning and other strategies to enhance capacity at public colleges and universities.</p>	<p>a.-1) By June 2000 public institutions will conduct e-training faculty and staff needs assessments, inventory existing training efforts, and establish training level targets; the HECB will establish an e-training advisory team to plan inter-institutional training activities.</p> <p>a.-2) By December 2001 establish cross-institutional e-training network, publish and disseminate schedule of training opportunities; by June 2001 pilot inter-institutional training activities.</p> <p>b.-1) By 2010 the average full-time equivalent student will receive one and one-half lecture contact hours per week through e-learning; by 2010 public colleges and universities will use classroom stations an additional two hours per week.</p> <p>b.-2) By January 2000, the HECB — in collaboration with institutions, OFM, and the Legislature — will establish capital budget guidelines for the 2001-2003 biennium that provide incentives for full utilization of public buildings.</p>

GOAL 5	STRATEGIES	RECOMMENDED ACTION
<p>Enhance the ability of institutions to meet student needs and compete in an increasingly complex marketplace.</p>	<p>a.) Identify and remove unwarranted obstacles to articulation and meeting student program demand.</p> <p>b.) Reward increased productivity with greater budget flexibility.</p> <p>c.) Encourage partnerships to enhance the quality and availability of higher education.</p> <p>d.) Recognize and support “centers of excellence.”</p>	<p>a.-1) By June, 2000, colleges and universities, in collaboration with students, will identify institutional and other obstacles to meeting students’ program demand and barriers to students’ academic progress.</p> <p>a.-2) By October 2000, the HECB will analyze these institutional reports and, if warranted, work across sectors and institutions to develop solutions that can be piloted within “opportunity zones.” These pilot projects and <u>high-demand programs to which the state should target FTE enrollments will be included in budget recommendations</u> to the Legislature and Governor.</p> <p>b.) By November, 2000, the HECB will forward to the Legislature and Governor institutional budget recommendations that allow institutions to reinvest savings into quality initiatives and teaching incentives.</p> <p>c.-1) Within overall budget priorities, the HECB will give greater support to institutional budget proposals that show partnerships among institutions: among K-12, and two- and four-year institutions; both public and independent institutions; with education institutions and with business.</p> <p><u>c.-2) By June, 2001, in coordination with the HECB and higher education institutions, Washington business leaders should establish a state-wide database clearinghouse to provide coordinate and to leverage industry support for higher education.</u> <u>The clearinghouse will provide a centrally maintained and universally accessible database of industry support and of higher education program needs within the state. Readily available information can alleviate the difficulty in effectively matching resources and needs. This clearinghouse also should be the focal point for implementing many of the other initiatives described in this section.</u></p> <p>d.) By March 2000, the HECB in collaboration with two- and four-year institutions will establish criteria required for an institutional program or initiative to be designated a “center of excellence,” and an official process and forum for awarding such designation.</p>

**THE INVESTMENTS REQUIRED TO MEET PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION NEEDS
— AND A PLAN TO PAY FOR THEM**

INVESTMENTS TO ACHIEVE THE HECB VISION

Creating the student-centered higher education system described in the 2000 Master Plan will require new investments. Much of this investment is directly driven by the goal to provide college opportunity that is affordable. Our public colleges and universities, too, must contribute to developing new pathways to learning, to fostering creativity and efficiency, and to enhancing the quality higher education.

INVESTMENTS IN STUDENT CAPACITY AND SUCCESS: \$ Millions

(Annual amounts required in 2010 above the FY 2001 budget level, in FY 2001 constant dollars)

Provide access at current levels.....	162.4
Fund current financial aid programs for these additional students.....	23.2
Provide additional access to upper-division/graduate students.....	187.9
Fund current financial aid programs for these additional students.....	4.1
Promise Scholarship Program.....	59.6
Guaranteed Education Tuition Program	33.8
Support needy students through State Need Grant and Work Study.....	44.7
Create the HELLO network.....	4.6
<hr/>	
Subtotal	520.3

INITIATIVES BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS TO ASSIST STUDENTS:

Investments in quality enhancement and teaching incentives.....	102.1
Funding for innovative efforts.....	4.0
Inter-institutional e-learning training for faculty and staff	2.0
Centers of Excellence.....	5.0
<hr/>	
Subtotal	113.1

Total, Annual Investments in 2010	633.4
--	--------------

RESOURCES TO REALIZE GREATER OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The benefits of a strong higher education system are enjoyed by all segments of society: institutions, students, families, business, and communities. Therefore, all those who benefit should share the costs of these investments. Following is a summary of annual resources and potential savings that can be used to fund the investments proposed in the 2000 Master Plan.

Contribution by institutions:

Reprioritize programs and functions; reallocate from lowest to highest priorities no less than 1 percent of institutional state funding per year through 2010	102.1
---	-------

Contribution by students and families

Link tuition levels to growth in state personal income.....	65.3
---	------

Better preparation for college-level work allows average high school graduate to enter college with the equivalent of one quarter of college credit, reducing time-to-degree.....	59.3
---	------

Contribution by business

Partner with institutions and students to provide financial and in-kind support, loaned faculty, and other arrangements.....	65.3
--	------

Public investment

Direct <u>real</u> growth in public revenues to higher education. These resources are driven solely by the growth in state population.....	161.6
--	-------

Continue the commitment of Washington State to broad public access to quality postsecondary education	186.6
---	-------

Total, Annual Resources in 2010	640.2
--	--------------

This sharing of contributions to support excellence and opportunity in postsecondary education is a balanced and equitable approach. All who benefit from a high-quality system of higher education share a responsibility to fund it.

The Governor and Legislature must implement the last two items on this list in the state budget process. The estimate of real growth in state revenues is based on OFM projections of state population. Increasing the state's funding for higher education can be accomplished in increments over time. It will require increased investment consistently over the next 10 years — but at a rate that is less than half rate of increase accomplished in the last budget, less than two-tenths of a percent per year through 2010. This renewed commitment is possible — and

necessary — if Washington State citizens are to be prepared for life and careers in the next century.

The contributions from institutions, students, parents, and business can be implemented without specific state action/legislation in each year. The Legislature can grant institutions the authority to implement efficiency savings and redirect those savings into quality improvements.

Institutions or the Legislature can set tuition levels to approximate the growth in state personal income — a valid measure of state residents' ability to pay for college. Parents can support ongoing programs such as Running Start and College in the High School that accelerate the completion of college credits before students formally begin their college education.

Business leaders can step up to the challenge of supporting institutions, programs and students at the same time they enjoy the economic and community benefits of an adequately trained and educated workforce. The contribution by business can take many forms: direct financial support of institutional programs, financial support of students and their efforts to save through the GET program, use of facilities and equipment, staff time and expertise, discounted purchases, partnering and mentoring, loaned faculty and facilities for high-demand programs, and many other matching or in-kind contributions.

Facility Utilization and Capital Requirements Through 2010

To accommodate projected enrollment growth at the public institutions, the HECB carefully evaluated current facility utilization practices, and considered how e-learning may change the average weekly amount of student "seat-time" in classrooms and class labs. This examination revealed that a significant increase in institutional enrollment capacity in existing scheduled instructional space is possible by modest increases in the amount of time that classrooms and class labs are scheduled for use each week. Also, the analysis revealed that modest assumptions about future non-seat time instruction through e-learning also adds capacity.

For example, if classrooms stations are used two additional hours per week and the average full-time equivalent student receives one and one-half lecture contact hours per week through e-learning, the classroom enrollment capacity of existing and planned space is increased by 42,000 student FTE at the public colleges and universities. Using these revised utilization standards, the following projections of public sector capacity and capital needs through 2010 were developed.

These estimates assume that the main campuses of the four year institutions receive their respective proportion of total 1998 enrollment applied to the Board's 2010 enrollment goal up to the maximum enrollment level for a campus as established by institutional policy or regulatory constraints. Enrollment levels for the branch campuses and centers is based on the Governor's and HECB's development plan for these locations, up to their respective institutional growth policy.

Student FTE Enrollment Levels and Planned Capacity	
--	--

Fall 1998 State Funded Enrollment (FTE) - Public Universities and Colleges	201,887
2010 State Funded Enrollment Goal (FTE) - Public Universities and Colleges	261,333
Planned 2010 Enrollment Capacity (FTE)	264,623
FTE Capacity Above Fall 1998 FTE Enrollment	62,736

Capital Costs to Achieve Planned Capacity

<i>Cost Savings per New Utilization Goals</i>	<i>\$89,964,552</i>
---	----------------------------

Total Estimated Higher Education Capital Need Through 2010 (1999 Dollars)		
FTE Growth		\$1,681,872,264
Minimum Preservation		\$1,260,000,000
Total		\$2,941,872,264
Community & Technical Colleges	\$1,239,361,040	
Public Four Year	\$1,702,511,224	
Adjusted For Construction Inflation (3.37% per year)		\$3,452,537,584
Total Estimated Revenue For Higher Education Capital		\$2,844,359,241
(Assumes 50% of bond authorizations through 2007-2009 and 5% annual growth in non-bond sources of revenue)		
Estimated Shortfall		(\$608,178,343)
2001-2003		(\$40,899,249)
2003-2005		(\$144,339,411)
2005-2007		(\$168,707,688)
2007-2009		(\$254,231,995)

RESOLUTION NO. 99-39

WHEREAS, State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to prepare *a comprehensive master plan that includes but is not limited to: Assessments of the state's higher education needs; recommendations on enrollment and other policies and actions to meet those needs; and guidelines for continuing education, adult education, public service, and other higher education programs;* and

WHEREAS, The Board has insisted on an open and inclusive process, sensitive to its statutory role to represent the "broad public interest in higher education, above the interests of individual institutions"; and

WHEREAS, The Board has considered a number of in-depth policy papers designed to discuss and analyze the issues central to the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, In July 1999, the Board approved an outline for the 2000 Master Plan, including three primary policy goals that summarize the vision for higher education presented by this Master Plan, strategies that characterize each policy goal, and specific initiatives that described specific steps that should be taken in order to effect the strategy and policy goal to which each is linked; and

WHEREAS, The Board has met with citizens across the state, gathering ideas and concerns to be reflected in the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, As directed by the HECB, staff have included Board comments and discussion in the draft final Master Plan;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the draft final Master Plan language and the goals and strategies incorporated therein as presented on October 27, 1999;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Board thanks representatives of business, labor, higher education, and citizens groups for their participation in the master planning process, and commends staff for a job well done.

Adopted:

October 27, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Legislative Grant Program Update

October 27, 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There has been significant activity since the September meeting of the HECB in three of the grant programs assigned to the Board by the Legislature in 1999. The following report updates information that was presented at earlier meetings of the Board.

Expansion of enrollment in high-demand fields and programs: A review committee is evaluating about 30 proposals to expand undergraduate enrollments in high-demand fields that were received on October 15 from the public community and technical colleges and baccalaureate institutions. The Board received funding in the state operating budget to support 500 new full-time student enrollments during the 2000-2001 academic year. The review committee will recommend programs for Board approval in December. The HECB will contract for the enrollments with the successful institutions.

Information technology instruction grants: When the Board approved \$1.75 million in information technology grants in September, it directed the staff to conduct a second-round grant process to allocate approximately \$225,000 that remained from the Legislature's \$2 million allocation. The funding is designed to help the public baccalaureate institutions expand their capacity to provide information technology instruction. A second-round request for proposals has been distributed to the institutions; proposals are due to the HECB on November 15. Among the six baccalaureate institutions, only the University of Washington is not eligible for the second-round funding. The UW has already received approval for the maximum \$1 million grant that may be provided to any single institution.

Child care grants: A review committee is evaluating four proposals for the \$150,000 in biennial grant funding provided by the Legislature for child care improvement grants to the four-year universities and college. The Legislature provided the funding in equal one-year increments to support the provisions of Senate Bill 5277. The review committee will recommend funding to the Board, which is scheduled to authorize the grants in December.

Community Scholarships: Beginning in 1989 and for most of the past decade, the Legislature has allocated the HECB funding to support a limited number of \$2,000 matching grants to community-based organizations in Washington State that raise equal amounts of private contributions. The scholarships have been used to help local high school graduates attend college. Funding for up to 50 matching grants was included in the state budget for 1997-99.

This year, the Legislature provided a major funding increase — a total of \$502,000 for the biennium — that will enable the state to offer up to 251 matching grants. If community organizations can raise the necessary matching funding, this enhancement would provide for five times as many grants as in the just-completed biennium.

Under current program rules, to be eligible to apply for grants, local organizations must

- Have a higher education scholarship program;
- Possess tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code;
- Raise at least \$2,000 in new money for scholarships (not including funds from endowments or trusts);
- Award scholarships without regard to age, sex, race, creed, etc.; and
- Not previously have received a matching award from the program.

The 1999-2001 budget directs the Board to extend a priority to groups that are affiliated with the Citizens Scholarship Foundation of America (the umbrella group for the "Dollars for Scholars" program). So far, organizers for the Dollars for Scholars group report that they have received expressions of interest from about 15 organizations.

As a result of the Legislature's budget action, there is an unprecedented amount of scholarship money available to students in communities where local groups can raise the necessary matching funds. However, it is not clear that the Dollars for Scholars organization will be successful in gaining affiliations with enough groups to take advantage of a significant portion of the available funding.

2000 HECB Legislative Session Overview

October 1999

BACKGROUND

The Washington Legislature will convene the 2000 session on Monday, Jan. 10. The regular session will last a maximum of 60 days.

This report presents a brief outline of the higher education issues that are expected to receive legislative review and consideration. It is a preliminary document for the Higher Education Coordinating Board members to use in considering legislative priorities for the 2000 session. The HECB is scheduled to adopt its formal legislative agenda for the 2000 session on December 3, when it is scheduled to meet in Olympia.

STATEWIDE HIGHER EDUCATION ISSUES

2000 Master Plan for Higher Education

The state law that governs HECB operations directs the Board to prepare a statewide Higher Education Master Plan every four years. The next Master Plan will be delivered to the Governor and Legislature prior to the 2000 session. The law requires the Legislature to hold hearings on the plan and to pass a concurrent resolution approving the plan or recommending changes. The Master Plan as approved by the Legislature then becomes state higher education policy unless legislation is enacted to change the policies contained in the plan.

Washington Promise Scholarship

The Governor and Legislature enacted the Washington Promise Scholarship program earlier this year through a section of the biennial operating budget. Because the budget authority extends only until June 30, 2001, the Legislature is expected to consider establishing the Washington Promise Scholarship in state law, thus making it a permanent element of the state's higher education student aid system.

The Governor and Legislature also may consider a supplemental budget enhancement for the program to increase scholarship amounts to the full rate of community college tuition for the coming year. The current funding supported a Promise Scholarship grant of \$1,125 for the current year. The Governor has indicated his support for an increase to raise the level to 100 percent of the full-time resident tuition rate at the community colleges, currently \$1,584.

Guaranteed Education Tuition

When the Legislature established the Guaranteed Education Tuition (GET) program in 1997, it directed the program's three-member governing body to report and make recommendations on the administration and projected financial solvency of the program by the end of 1999.

The GET Committee is chaired by HECB Executive Director Marc Gaspard and includes State Treasurer Mike Murphy and Office of Financial Management Director Dick Thompson. The

committee met recently to consider its recommendations, and agreed to develop a proposal to make minor changes in the current law for consideration by the Governor and Legislature next year.

In September 1998 (HECB Resolution 98-29), the HECB approved a resolution to the Governor and Legislature and the GET governing committee that the HECB be permanently charged in state law with ongoing responsibility for the administration of the program.

Supplemental Budget Proposals

Discussion of the Legislature's options for developing a supplemental operating budget for the 1999-2001 biennium has centered on the uncertainty posed by Initiative 695. The budget outlook will remain very clouded until sometime after the November election.

Meanwhile, the Governor's Office of Financial Management has received supplemental budget proposals from a number of state agencies, including higher education institutions. The Board will receive more information and hear an overview of supplemental budget issues at the October 27 meeting.

OTHER PROSPECTIVE LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Several issues that have been considered by legislative subcommittees or informal groups of legislators may be the subject of legislative action in 2000. Several of these issues are described below.

- **Accountability:** The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Council of Presidents and the HECB are sponsoring two forums on higher educational accountability this fall. The first forum took place Oct. 13 in Tacoma; the second is scheduled for Nov. 30 in Olympia. The forums are designed to promote discussion among legislators, colleges and universities, and state higher education policy-makers regarding the future direction for accountability efforts. Discussions are focusing on performance measurement and accountability of the public baccalaureate institutions.
- **House Capital Budget Subcommittee on Higher Education:** A subcommittee of the House Capital Budget Committee has been studying the capital budget needs of higher education institutions, in light of projections for significant increases in student enrollment. The subcommittee is discussing a number of options for meeting the capital costs related to long-term student access needs, including construction of new buildings, renovation and maintenance of existing facilities and the increasing use of alternative e-learning technologies to hold down capital costs.
- **Competency-based Admissions:** The chairs of the House and Senate Education and Higher Education committees met recently to discuss linkages between K-12 education reform and admission to higher education. The group reviewed the HECB's competency-based admissions project, and the legislators tentatively expressed interest in expanding the discussion to include issues related to K-12 teacher training.

Western Washington University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program

October 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Western Washington University proposes to offer a **Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program**. This program would complement the other four geographic-based human services programs offered by WWU in Bellingham, Kitsap/Silverdale, Everett, and Seattle. It would be delivered, with Washington State University offering some specialty courses, via **multiple instructional technologies**.

The program is designed to prepare individuals for careers in fields such as social services, education, and health care. Professionals in all of these fields are and will continue to be in **high demand**.

The **diversity plan** supports the state's and institution's aspirations to increase the participation rates of under-represented populations in higher education. The **assessment plan** is well designed to measure student learning outcomes and program vitality.

The BA in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program would be funded on a **self-sustaining basis** by **revenue generated by student tuition**. It would be supported by a core of regular faculty and comprehensive support services. The cost per FTE student would be about **\$4,068**.

RECOMMENDATION

The Western Washington University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program is recommended for approval, effective October 27, 1999. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WWU would submit actual costs for the cybersite distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, 30 days after the current and next cybersite student cohorts complete their programs, WWU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Western Washington University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program

October 1999

INTRODUCTION

The Bachelor of Arts in Human Services is a popular program currently offered via traditional face-to-face classroom instruction at the Western Washington University (WWU) main campus in Bellingham and at off-campus sites in Kitsap/Silverdale, Everett, and Seattle. In fall 1996, WWU established a cybersite location for the program and piloted several courses. Use of the cybersite as either a primary or ancillary program location allows students to choose the course delivery method that best meets their needs.

PROGRAM NEED

Definition

The human services program prepares individuals to work in communities that provide educational and social services to the public through governmental, nonprofit, or private agencies. It focuses on specific knowledge and skills related to the field as well as general professional competencies.

Relationship to Institutional Mission

The proposed program would support the mission of WWU's Woodring College of Education by offering time- and place-bound individuals access to education and professional development for careers in the public and private marketplace.

Relationship to Program Plan

The proposed program was not included in WWU's biennial program plan.

Relationship to Other Institutions

WWU is the only public institution in the state offering a BA in Human Services. Five community colleges, which are a primary source of students enrolling in the WWU program, offer an associate degree in human services. Washington State University (WSU) offers a BA in Human Development. In accordance with a Memorandum of Understanding between WWU and WSU, the two universities will offer specialty courses through the cybersite location to support one another's programs. Potential also exists for an interstate program delivery to meet a nationwide need for bilingual human services professionals working with Headstart programs.

Student Interest and Occupational Demand

Student interest in the cybersite program is keen. To date, 52 students have enrolled in the web-based pilot courses. Although the cybersite program has not been advertised during the past year, about 30 individuals are on a waiting list to enroll upon HECB approval of the program.

WWU representatives report that Washington State and the nation are experiencing growing demand for human services professionals. There are several circumstances that explain this phenomenon.

1. Many positions formerly held by individuals who qualified through their work experience are now available only to those with college degrees. A bachelor's or master's degree is becoming the standard credential for entry level employment.
2. As a condition for federal funding, Headstart programs require human services professionals to possess an associate degree and eventually earn a bachelor's degree.
3. Nationwide, there is a rising population of elderly and disabled folks who require an extensive array of human services.
4. There is a critical need for the professional development of bilingual human services professionals that can serve migratory farmworkers on a national basis.

WWU's cybersite distance education program will meet this occupational demand, in part, by supplying competent graduates. The National Headstart Association, National Migrant Headstart Association, and Early Childhood Education Assistance Program are keenly aware of the changing educational requirements for human services professionals and are interested in forging alliances with Western. This data supports the cybersite expansion of WWU's human services program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Curriculum

Appendix A presents the program of study required of students pursuing the BA in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program.

Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

The major goals of the human services program are to train human services professionals to work with a wide range of community agencies and organizations, and to integrate theory and practice in preparation for work in human services. The program has clearly articulated student learning outcomes to guide the teaching and assessment of quality learning of its students. As displayed in Appendix B, the student learning outcomes are consistent with the standards established by The National Council for Standards in Human Services.

Delivery

Courses, assignments, and discussion groups will be available to students through a variety of technologies. They include asynchronous and synchronous computer mediated conferencing, streaming video, teleconferencing, face-to-face intensive class sessions, print materials, and e-mail.

As a prerequisite for admission to the human services program, students must demonstrate successful completion of a basic computer course. A sample class is offered through the distance education link of the WWU Woodring College of Education website. This sample class enables students to test the compatibility of their equipment, software, and basic computer knowledge before enrolling in the program.

Students

Program Size. The program will initially enroll 36 FTE students and reach full size of 141 FTE students in five years.

Time-to-Degree. Most students will be able to complete this program in 6 to 8 quarters, over a period of 18 to 24 months.

Diversity Plan

WWU representatives claim that the BA in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program should serve more students of color, older students, and transfer students. Specific strategies to recruit and retain these populations include links with tribal colleges, community colleges, and targeted outreach to diverse communities.

Resources

The proposed program will be supported by existing full-time and adjunct faculty. They receive training and support on pedagogical issues associated with the delivery of web-based courses. Program administration, coordination, and support services will be provided essentially through existing means.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Assessment Plan

The program has developed a set of comprehensive assessment methods to evaluate faculty performance, student achievement, and program effectiveness. Examples are included in Appendix C.

External Reviews

In March 1999, a comprehensive program evaluation including all geographic sites and the pilot cybersite location was completed by WWU at the request of HECB staff. In April 1999, WWU engaged an outside consultant (James F. Carroll, Human Services Program Chair at Tacoma Community College) to review WWU's self-study and identify the program's strengths and areas for improvement. The evaluation conclusions of both parties were generally positive, reflecting a high degree of graduate satisfaction with the program and subsequent employment. An action plan has been developed to address areas for improvement.

In August 1999, the proposal was presented to the Inter-Institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning (ICAPP). The committee members supported the proposal and acknowledged the collaboration between WWU and WSU in its delivery.

COST OF PROGRAM

Appendix D displays the projected program budget for the program. It will be funded on a self-sustaining basis. Revenue from student tuition pays all expenses associated with the delivery and administration of the program. It is expected that program costs will run about \$142,000 per year, and approximately \$4,068 per FTE student.

FINDINGS

1. The proposed BA in Human Development Cybersite Distance Education Program has the potential to contribute significantly to higher education access and to the evolution of best practices in e-learning.
2. The program supports the Board's initiatives for higher education in numerous ways, including expanded use of instructional technologies, increased partnerships with other universities in the delivery of programs, and greater participation of under-represented populations in higher education.
3. Student interest and occupational demand have been demonstrated.
4. Resources are adequate to support quality instruction and support services for students and faculty alike.
5. The assessment plan is well suited for the distance education program, and should ensure student success and program enhancements.
6. The costs are reasonable and will be supported by student tuition revenues.

RECOMMENDATION

The Western Washington University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program is recommended for approval, effective October 27, 1999. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WWU will submit actual costs for the cybersite distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, 30 days after the current and next cybersite student cohorts complete their programs, WWU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Program of Study
APPENDIX B	Student Learning Outcomes
APPENDIX C	Assessment Plan
APPENDIX D	Program Budget

For a copy of the appendices, please contact the HECB at 360-753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-38

WHEREAS, Western Washington University is proposing to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program; and

WHEREAS, The program has the potential to contribute significantly to higher education access and to the evolution of best practices in e-learning; and

WHEREAS, The program will respond to the increasing demand for professionals in human services; and

WHEREAS, Washington State University will have the opportunity to contribute some specialty courses; and

WHEREAS, The program supports the Board's initiatives for higher education, including expanded use of instructional technologies, increased partnerships with other universities, and greater participation of under-represented populations in higher education; and

WHEREAS, Resources are adequate to support a quality program and support services; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable and will be supported by student tuition revenues;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves Western Washington University's request to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services Cybersite Distance Education Program, effective October 27, 1999. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WWU will submit actual costs for the cybersite distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, 30 days after the current and next cybersite student cohorts complete their programs, WWU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Adopted:

October 27, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary